



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/560,541

05/25/2006

Nhut Xan Phung

SP10150P00050US

6446

32116

7590

06/26/2008

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. MADISON STREET
SUITE 3800
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

JACOB, AJITH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/560,541	Applicant(s) PHUNG, NHUT XAN	
	Examiner AJITH JACOB	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fries et al. (US 6,460,029 B1).

For claim 1, Fries et al. teaches:

A method for searching a plurality of machine-readable information sources, said method comprising the steps of:

mapping a search string to a plurality of search terms, wherein each said search term

relates to at least one of said plurality of machine-readable information sources [logical search query generated from user entered text search query, column 2, lines 10-17];

indicating at least one of said plurality of machine-readable information source that each said search term relates to [related term matching, column 11, lines 1-12];

and searching at least one indicated machine-readable information source using

selected ones of said search terms [search after related words are found, column 11, 41-48].

For claim 2, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, comprising the further steps of receiving said initial search term from a user and providing a result of said search to said user [receiving search request and provide result, column 2, lines 3-17].

For claim 3, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 2, wherein said step of indicating comprises one or more of the steps in the group of steps consisting of:

indicating to said user which of said plurality of machine-readable information sources each of said search terms relates to [identify search goals, column 15, lines 21-34]; and indicating to said user at least one vocabulary each said search term is included in, wherein each vocabulary relates to one of said information sources [match vocabulary, column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 4, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 3, comprising the further step of enabling said user to select and de-select ones of said plurality of machine-readable information sources whereon said searching step is performed [user options to improve results, column 5, lines 30-43].

For claim 5, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 3, comprising the further step of enabling said user to replace ones of said plurality of search terms with user-selected replacement search terms [provide suggestions to user, column 5, lines 44-63].

For claim 6, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 3, comprising the further step of enabling said user to add

Art Unit: 2161

further search terms to said plurality of search terms [modifying search query, column 19, lines 30-39].

For claim 7, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein each of said plurality of search terms is selected from a vocabulary of terms used in a related one of said plurality of machine-readable information sources [vocabulary terms based on topic, column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 8, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein said plurality of search terms are selected from a meta-vocabulary comprising a list of terms included in a plurality of vocabularies list of recent vocabulary terms, column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 10, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein said mapping step is performed once only for searching a particular search string [ability to search and store on first query, column 2, lines 3-9].

For claim 11, Fries et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein said search string comprises a plurality of terms and said step of mapping comprises the step of mapping each of said plurality of terms to a plurality of synonyms [words in search step, using synonyms to match results, column 26, lines 30-45].

Claim 12 is an apparatus of claim 1. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 13 is an apparatus of claim 2. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 2 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 14 is an apparatus of claim 3. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 3 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 15 is an apparatus of claim 4. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 4 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 16 is an apparatus of claim 5. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 17 is an apparatus of claim 6. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 6 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 18 is an apparatus of claim 7. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 7 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 19 is an apparatus of claim 8. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 8 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 21 is an apparatus of claim 10. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 22 is an apparatus of claim 11. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 11 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 23 is a computer program of claim 1. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 24 is a computer program of claim 2. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 2 for the reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 25 is a computer program of claim 3. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 3 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 26 is a computer program claim 4. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 4 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 27 is a computer program claim 5. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 28 is an apparatus of claim 6. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 6 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 29 is a computer program claim 7. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 7 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 30 is a computer program claim 8. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 8 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 32 is a computer program of claim 10. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 33 is a computer program of claim 11. Fries et al. teaches the limitations of claim 11 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 because it is the same method claim without the output indication.

Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 because it is the same apparatus claim without the output indication.

Claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23 because it is the same computer program claim without the output indication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 20 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fries et al. as set forth above against claims 1-3 above, and in view of Turtle et al. (US 5,418,948).

As per claim 9, Fries et al. teaches the searching of a user query and finding results [logical search query generated from user entered text search query, column 2, lines 10-17], but does not teach the use of a medical database for information sources.

Turtle et al. teaches the use of medical databases for searching [column 7, lines 28-34].

Fries et al. (US 6,460,029 B1) and Turtle et al. (US 5,418,948) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of search query result retrieval.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the searching method described by Fries et al. and add a medical database as taught by Turtle et al.

The motivation for doing so would be “to identify phrases in the search query” [column 3, lines 3-20] that pertain to the medical field.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fries et al. (US 6,460,029 B1) with Turtle et al. (US 5,418,948) for providing a medical database in the search process.

Claim 20 is an apparatus of claim 9. Fries et al. modified by Turtle et al. teaches the limitations of claim 9 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 31 is a computer program claim 9. Fries et al. modified by Turtle et al. teaches the limitations of claim 9 for the reasons stated above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument.

For claim 1, applicant argues that Fries et al. (US 6,460,029 B1) does not teach mapping to search terms that each relate to at least one machine-readable information source that may be searched and searching for search terms. Reference clearly teaches searching for search terms from entered string [column 2, lines 10-17] and searching based on this term [column 11, lines 1-12].

For claim 3, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to disclose indicating to a user which particular machine-readable information search term relates to along with at least one vocabulary related to a machine-readable information source that each search term is included in. Fries et al. teaches vocabulary relation of term [column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 4, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach enabling a user to select and de-select machine readable sources to be searched. Fries et al. clearly teaches options to select or deselect search areas by user [column 5, lines 30-43].

For claim 5, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach enabling a user to replace search terms with user-selected replacement search terms. Reference clearly teaches suggestions to replace term for user [column 5, lines 44-63].

For claim 6, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach user adding further search terms to an existing plurality of search terms mapped from a search string. Fries et al. clearly teaches modification of search after existing search [column 19, lines 30-39].

For claim 7, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach a vocabulary of terms used in a related machine-readable information source, from which the plurality of search terms is selected. Fries et al. teaches vocabulary relation of term [column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 8, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach a vocabulary of terms used in a related machine-readable information source, from which the plurality of search terms is selected. Fries et al. teaches vocabulary relation of term [column 15, lines 21-34].

For claim 10, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach mapping of search string to terms, wherein each term relates to at least one machine-readable information source, is performed once only for that particular search string. Reference clearly teaches storing the one search performed for the string [column 2, lines 3-9].

For claim 11, applicant argues that Fries et al. fails to teach each term to be mapped to a plurality of synonyms. Fries et al. clearly teaches mapping to synonyms of the term [column 26, lines 30-45].

Arguments against claim 34 have been addressed above for claim 1.

In light of the forgoing arguments, the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajith Jacob whose telephone number is 571-270-1763. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/22/2008

/A.J./
Patent Examiner

/K. B. P./

/Apu M Mofiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161